

WRITTEN STATEMENT PER 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b) REGARDING
SUBSTANCE OF JUNE 2, 2009, APPLICANT
INITIATED TELEPHONE INTERVIEW WITH THE EXAMINER

Applicants appreciate the opportunity to discuss the objections and rejections in this application with Examiner Brian J. Berman and Primary Examiner Donald Champagne, in the telephone interview on June 2, 2009. In accordance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.113(b), and the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 713.04, Applicants provide the following written statement of the reasons presented at the interview warranting favorable action.

Those participating in the interview were Examiner Berman, Primary Examiner Champagne, and attorneys Steven M. Freeland and Shirin Tefagh. No exhibits were shown or discussed. The following is a brief summary of the interview, which was initiated by the Applicant.

Possible allowable subject matter, and specifically claim 17 was discussed. In the present Final Office Action the Examiner stated that claim 17 would be allowable over the cited references if Applicant adopted "language that makes 'a scheduled meeting' functional to have patentable distinction." Applicants and Examiner discussed possible amendments that would read over the cited prior art. The examiner agreed that reciting that the scheduled meeting was stored on the device would read over the cited references.

Next, the support for the proposed amendment in the specification was discussed. The Applicant pointed to portions of the specification, paragraphs 0003, 0073 and FIG. 7 and accompanying discription, and the Examiner agreed that at least these portions of the specification provided enough support for the amendments to claim 17 and further for a new claim reciting that the scheduling of the meeting was done using the device's calendar function.

The interview then ended with the understanding that Applicants would file a response amending claim 17 as agreed, and that such amendment would overcome the rejection of claim 17. The Examiner did however, note that he would have to conduct further search before allowing the discussed claims.